

April 16, 1953

Dear Luca:

This is a postscript to my letter of the 13th. I hope I do not disturb you from your task of assimilating my notes.

We have just received the pre-prints of the current symposium on bacterial adaptation in London, for the SGM. Unless you have already had this some time, it would be unreasonable to try to digest it for our review. I am astonished at the prevalence of the physiological-adaptationist view-- but suppose it is the same problem the geneticist has always faced in trying to explain the miracle of evolution in terms of modern population genetics. I am encouraged that we should again restate a strong (but circumspect) case along the lines of our review; I had wondered before whether there was much point in repeating the arguments.

The following references can now be completed:

Potter, R. 1951 Sequential blocking of metabolic pathways in vitro. Proc. Soc. Exp. Biol. Med., N.Y., 76:41-46 (in place of Potter & Meddelberger).

The full title for Graessle & Pietrowski is "The in vitro effect of para-aminosalicylic acid (PAS) in preventing acquired resistance to streptomycin in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. J. Bact. 57:459-464

I forgot to mention the reference for Dittrich:

→ Bornscheim, H., Dittrich, W., and Hühne, G. 1951 Zur Entstehung der Chemo-resistenz bei Bakterien. Naturwissenschaften 16:383-384.

[I do not suppose you are unaware of any of these references, but hoped to save you some trouble in looking any of them up, as long as I had them fairly close at hand.]

Save us from the thought! But it occurs to me someone (namely anyone but myself) could well afford to expand the subject of our review into a monograph ("Genetics and Chemotherapy") that might have as wide a usefulness as, e.g., Work & Work's book on the "[Biochemical] Basis of Chemotherapy".

I am very pleased to learn of your election as the sectional VicePresident. I could advise you better as to candidates for Presidency if I knew better just who was going. Either Beadle or Tatum would be an excellent choice. I know that Sonneborn is going to the Genetics Congress, but suppose he is a bit too far removed. How about Lwoff? Pontecorvo would be perfectly appropriate too.

As it looks now very doubtful whether I will be able to go myself, I must again ask your specific advice about the filter. I am suspicious about the advisability of sending the entire U-tube, but will do so if you do not have access to a glass-blower. It would be too much of an imposition to ask someone to carry such a fragile item, which then has to be wrapped in a bulky package. I enclose a sketch of the tube. Please advise me what to do. I have the filter itself and could send it, or the U-tube immediately.

I am interested in your comment in reversal of polarity. Frankly, I do not see how this can happen under crossing conditions. Recall the experiments with W-1305 (M-T-L-F+) which provoked no prototrophs when washed cells were plated with M-F- plus T-L-F-, but required some period of incubation in broth to effectively transfer

FOLD SIDES OVER AND THEN FOLD BOTTOM UP AND SEAL.
NO OTHER ENVELOPE SHOULD BE USED.